



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 150
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/660,950

09/11/2003

Shawn O'Donnell

21863-000100

7016

20350 7590 02/23/2007

TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER
EIGHTH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, MAIKHANH

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2176

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
--	-----------	---------------

3 MONTHS

02/23/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/660,950

Applicant(s)

O'DONNELL, SHAWN

Examiner

Maikhanh Nguyen

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 December 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/04/06</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: RCE filed 12/04/2006 to the original application filed 09/11/2003.

Claims 1-20 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1, 5, 7, 11, 13, 17, and 19 have been amended. Claims 1, 5, 7, 11, 13, and 17 are independent claims.

Request Continuation for Examination

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 12/04/2006 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Rawat et al.**

(US Patent No. 6662340, filed 05/2002) in view of **Lee et al.** (US Patent No. 5946691, issued 08/31/1999).

As to claim 5:

Rawat teaches a computer-implemented method of processing electronic forms (*e.g., examines electronic documents; see Abstract*), the method comprising:

- determining a first descriptor associated with a first field of a first electronic form (*e.g., field labels 102, in which each label is spatially and visually related to it corresponding field; col. 4, lines 42-45 and see fig. 1 and the associated text*);
- determining first information entered in the first field on the first electronic form (*see the filling form discussion beginning at col. 4, line 30 and col. 10, lines 13-15*); and
- determining if user information stored for a user comprises an identifier corresponding to the first descriptor (*e.g., field tags and then supplying the correct user data from a stored user profile, generally located on a remote server.*

Because no naming convention has existed for fields in an HTML form, it has

been difficult to produce a fully automated form-filler application. Previously, forms had to be mapped or analyzed in advance and the mapping saved in a database of form descriptions, usually also located on a remote server. Often, user intervention is required to complete the form ... The field labels are provided for the user's benefit to advise them of the correct information to enter into a particular field; col. 4, lines 31-49).

Rawat, however, does not specifically teach if the user information does not comprise an identifier corresponding to the first descriptor, updating the user information whereby an identifier corresponding to the first descriptor is included in the user information and the first information is associated with the identifier corresponding to the first descriptor and if the user information comprises an identifier corresponding to the first descriptor updating the user information whereby the first information is associated with identifier corresponding to the first descriptor.

Lee teaches if the user information does not comprise an identifier corresponding to the first descriptor, updating the user information whereby an identifier corresponding to the first descriptor is included in the user information and the first information is associated with the identifier corresponding to the first descriptor and if the user information comprises an identifier corresponding to the first descriptor updating the user information whereby the first information is associated with identifier corresponding to the first descriptor (*e.g., automatically updates the filing identifier when information in the*

selected fields is modified... automatically updating the predefined filing formats if the information received in at least one of the information fields is modified. Also, the predefined filing identifier may be updated simultaneously with the updating of the preselected formats/ automatically generating, by the computer system, a plurality of predefined filing formats for the filing identifier based on the information received in at least one of the data fields of the data record. Each predefined filing format is contained in a filing format field. The computer may select one of the predefined filing formats for the filing identifier by automatically inserting one of the predefined filing format fields into the designated field. ... automatically updating the information in the predefined filing format fields if the information received in at least one of the data fields is modified. Additionally, a plurality of options for selecting one of the predefined filing formats for automatic insertion in the designated field may be provided. Also, the filing identifier may be updated simultaneously with the updating of the predefined filing format fields; see the Abstract and col.2, line 1-15).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Rawat with Lee because Lee's teaching would have provided the capability for mapping user data to the appropriate form field by examining field label text on the form as the user sees it as well as evaluating the field context by determining the field type of neighboring fields to determine the required data.

As to claim 6:

Rawat teaches receiving information identifying a second electronic form (*see fig. 1 and see the quick checkout form discussion beginning at col. 4, line 28 and col. 5, lines 27-32*); determining a set of descriptors (*e.g., field labels, field names*) associated with a set of fields (*e.g., related to its corresponding field*) included in the second electronic form (*e.g., electronic forms*); the set of descriptors including the first descriptor; and displaying the second electronic form on a computer display such that the first information is displayed in the field of the second electronic form associated with the first descriptor (*see fig. 2 and the associated text*).

As to claim 19:

Rawat does not specifically teach “*adding the first descriptor to the user information.*”

Lee teaches updating the user information to include an identifier comprises adding the first descriptor to the user information (*col. 3, lines 51-60 and col. 4, line 65-col. 5, line 5*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Rawat with Lee because Lee’s teaching would have provided the capability for mapping user data to the appropriate form field by examining field label text on the form as the user sees it as well as evaluating the field context by determining the field type of neighboring fields to determine the required data.

As to claims 11-12:

Refer to claims 5-6 above. Claims 11-12 are the same as claims 5-6, except claims 11-12 are computer program product claims and claims 5-6 are method claims.

As to claim 17-18:

Refer to claims 5-6 above. Claims 17-18 are the same as claims 5-6, except claims 17-18 are system claims and claims 5-6 are method claims. *(It is noted that a processor, an output device; and a memory are inherent to the system of Rawat).*

As to claim 20:

Rawat teaches the identifier corresponding to the first descriptor is the first descriptor *(e.g., field labels 102, in which each labels is spatially and visually related to its corresponding field; col. 4, lines 43-67).*

As to claim 1:

The rejection of claim 5 above is incorporated herein in full. Additionally, Rawat teaches:

- receiving information identifying a first electronic form *(see fig. 1 and see the quick checkout form discussion beginning at col. 4, line 28 and col. 5, lines 27-32);*
- determining a set of descriptors *(e.g., field labels, field names)* associated with a set of fields *(e.g., fields)* included in the first electronic form, the set of descriptors

including a first descriptor associated with a first field (*e.g., each label is spatially and visually related to its corresponding field*) [col.4, lines 31-62];

- accessing user information comprising information identifying a set of identifiers stored for a user, the set of identifiers stored for the user including a first identifier corresponding to the first descriptor, wherein a first value is associated with the first identifier (*col.5, line 52-col.6, line 22*);
- displaying the first electronic form on a computer display such that the first value is displayed in the first field of the first electronic form (*see fig.1 and the associated text*);
- identifying at least a second descriptor associated with a field in the first electronic form that does not have a corresponding identifier in the set of identifiers stored for the user (*e.g., Form-filling software generally analyzes the fields 101 of the form and maps them to the correct user data by parsing the HTML field names, commonly known as field tags (not shown) and then supplying the correct user data from a stored user profile, generally located on a remote server ... the fields of the form are populated with the correct user data, without reference to a previous, stored mapping or analysis of the form, and without requiring user intervention; col. 4, lines 28-62*); and
- determining a second value entered in the field associated with the second descriptor (*col.4, lines 43-62*).

As to claim 2:

Rawat teaches the set of descriptors associated with the set of fields included in the first electronic form includes field names associated with the set of fields and the set of identifiers stored for the user comprises one or more field names associated with the set of fields (*col. 4, lines 38-62*).

As to claim 3:

Refer to the discussion of claim 6 above for rejection.

As to claim 4:

Rawat teaches determining a third value entered in the first field of the first electronic form that is different from the first value (*see fig. 2*). Rawat, however, does not specifically teach “*updating the user information such that the third value is associated with the first identifier.*”

Lee teaches updating the user information such that the third value is associated with the first identifier (*col. 8, line 60- col. 11, line 36 and see fig. 10 and the associated text*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Rawat with Lee because Lee’s teaching would have provided the capability for mapping user data to the appropriate form field by examining field label

text on the form as the user sees it as well as evaluating the field context by determining the field type of neighboring fields to determine the required data.

As to claims 7-8 and 10:

Refer to claims 1-2 and 4 above. Claims 7-8 and 10 are the same as claims 1-2 and 4, except claim 7-8 and 10 are computer program product claims and claims 1-2 and 4 are method claims.

As to claim 9:

Refer to the discussion of claim 6 above for rejection.

As to claim 13

Refer to claim 1 above. Claim 13 is the same as claim 1, except claim 13 is a system claim and claim 1 is a method claim. Additionally, Rawat teaches a communication network; a first computer; and a second computer (*see fig.3 and the associated text*).

As to claims 14-16:

They include the same limitations as in claims 2-4 above, and are similar rejected under the same rationale.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 12/04/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that *Daswani does not teach "involve adding an identifier corresponding to a first descriptor for an electronic form field to the user information and associating the first information entered in the first field of the electronic form with the identifier upon determining that the user information does not comprise an identifier corresponding to the first descriptor"* [Remarks, page 12].

In response, the examiner respectfully submits that the introduction of Lee, as combined with Rawat meets the limitations as claimed by Applicant.

Applicant argues that *Rawat does not teach updating a set of descriptors by including an identifier corresponding to a second descriptor and associating a second value, that is entered in the field, with the included identifier, wherein the updating is performed by a computer* [Remarks, page 14].

In response, the examiner respectfully submits that the new combination of Rawat and Lee meets the claim limitations. Lee teaches updating a set of descriptors by including an

identifier corresponding to a second descriptor and associating a second value, that is entered in the field, with the included identifier, wherein the updating is performed by a computer (*e.g., automatically updates the filing identifier when information in the selected fields is modified... automatically updating the predefined filing formats if the information received in at least one of the information fields is modified. Also, the predefined filing identifier may be updated simultaneously with the updating of the preselected formats/ automatically generating, by the computer system, a plurality of predefined filing formats for the filing identifier based on the information received in at least one of the data fields of the data record. Each predefined filing format is contained in a filing format field. The computer may select one of the predefined filing formats for the filing identifier by automatically inserting one of the predefined filing format fields into the designated field. ... automatically updating the information in the predefined filing format fields if the information received in at least one of the data fields is modified. Additionally, a plurality of options for selecting one of the predefined filing formats for automatic insertion in the designated field may be provided. Also, the filing identifier may be updated simultaneously with the updating of the predefined filing format fields; see the Abstract and col.2, line 1-15).*

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record, listed on PTO 892 provided to Applicant is considered to have relevancy to the claimed invention. Applicant should review each identified reference carefully before responding to this office action to properly advance the case in light of the prior art.

Contact information

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Maikhanh Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-4093. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 9:00am – 5:30 pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on (571) 272-4136.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2176

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

MN

William S. Bashore
WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER